UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/562,821	12/29/2005	Jean Francois Billiard	0518-1092-1	4049

466 7590 07/24/2007 YOUNG & THOMPSON 745 SOUTH 23RD STREET 2ND FLOOR ARLINGTON, VA 22202	**EXAMINER** HUR, ECE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2109	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/24/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/562,821	BILLIARD ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ECE HUR	2109	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>29 December 2005</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>13-24</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>13-24</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>29 December 2005</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. <u>10562821</u>.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/29/2005</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to application and IDS filed on December 29, 2005 in which claims 1-12 are cancelled and claims 13-24 are presented for examination. This application is a new PCT National Stage application of PCT/EPO04/51276 that was filed on June 28, 2004. Applicant is claiming priority for the foreign application EPO 03014928 filed on July 1, 2003.

Status of Claims

Claims 1-12 are cancelled and 13-24 are pending in the case. Claim 13 and 21 are the independent claims.
Claims 13-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Information Disclosure Statement Acknowledgement

The information disclosure statement filed on December 29, 2005 is in compliance with

the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609. It has been placed in the

application file, the information referred to therein has been considered as to the merits.

Priority Acknowledgement

Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35

U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). Receipt is acknowledged of certified copy of application EPO

03014928, filed on June 28, 2004 submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers

have been placed of record in the file.

Abstract Objection

Abstract is being objected to because of the following informalities:

The abstract of the disclosure does not commence on a separate sheet in

accordance with 37 CFR 1.52(b)(4). A new abstract of the disclosure is required and

must be presented on a separate sheet, apart from any other text. Appropriate

correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 13-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over of

Davis, US 2002/0130900 A1 in view of Sanderson, WO 02/44897 A1.

Regarding Claim 13, Davis discloses a system related to software applications in

client-server environments, and more particularly, to a system for generating an

interface for software applications in accordance with the desktop interface of the client

computer. Davis discloses the claimed aspect of graphic interfacing between a user and a computer system in which the following operations are performed "inputting a user request at the level of client terminal", wherein in the flowchart of FIG. 3, illustrates client computer 202 connects to server 102 and send a request from client computer 202(step 302) and the request is transmitted to a server part 104 in view of being processed and for generating a response. (Davis, FIG.1). Furthermore Davis discloses the claimed aspect of receiving the response at the level of the client terminal, displaying the response result for the user, wherein application storage 108 sends interface component and code component of the requested application. Specifically, Davis discloses the claimed aspect of the client terminal receives a response comprising instruction data and data to be displayed at the level of the client terminal, instruction data are executed in order to construct a visualization model to be used at the level of the client terminal, said visualization model is created through the association of construction elements locally available, wherein projector 100 transmits XML stream of interface component of software application to viewer 200 and viewer 200 has information about what each widget needed. (Davis, FIG.3).

However, Davis does not teach the claimed aspect of data to be displayed are merged with the visualization model in order to display merging result. On the other hand Sanderson discloses the claimed aspect, wherein UI generator communicates with databases and initiates a user interface. (Page 9, Paragraph 0010, lines 1-3). Specifically, Sanderson illustrates the aspect of displayed and merged data on the interface in FIG. 1, 104A.

It would be obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

enhance Davis's invention with Sanderson's invention to merge the interface with the

data, because all applications need data in order to perform a function.

Regarding Claim 14, most of the limitations have been met in Claim 13. See

Claim 13 for details. Davis discloses the claimed aspect of construction elements

including a descriptive interface of the visualization model objects, a presentation layer

and some logical rules to be applied locally to the visualization model, wherein viewer

200 renders the graphical user interface with the native widget set of the client

computer's operating system, based on the widget information from the projector and

therefore, the native widget set dictates the appearance of the widgets, such as their

style and shape, and the interface for the application looks and feels like a native

desktop application. (Davis, FIG. 3, See Abstract)

Regarding Claim 15, most of the limitations have been met in Claim 13. See

Claim 13 for details. Sanderson, achieves the claimed aspect of language resources

locally available or downloadable from the server part, one is associated to the created

visualization model, wherein in FIG. 1 the declarative User Interface is displayed in that

associated language.

Regarding Claim 16, most of the limitations have been met in Claim 13. See

Claim 13 for details. Davis achieves the aspect of some personalization display filters

are associated to the visualization model in order to modify the visual rendering of the

default visualization model at the level of the client terminal, wherein projector 100

transmits XML stream of interface component of software application to viewer 200 and

viewer 200 has information about what each widget needed. Specifically, Davis

discloses that the interface component includes information about all the widgets

needed to execute the application, such as their placement, size, and captions. The

viewer renders the graphical user interface with the native widget set of the client

computer's operating system, based on the widget information from the projector.

Therefore, the native widget set dictates the appearance of the widgets, such as their

style and shape, and the interface for the application looks and feels like a native

desktop application. (Davis, See Abstract). Also, Sanderson discloses the claimed

aspect wherein the configuration data and context file is parsed in FIG.4B, 428 to obtain

the workflow description and content specification. Specifically, Sanderson discloses

that the user will provide a content specification to the declarative User Interface

generator 103 specifying the type of data to be displayed in the dynamically generated

UI and the tasks with which the data can be accessed and manipulated through the

dynamically generated UI. (Sanderson, Page 13, Paragraph 20).

Regarding Claim 17, most of the limitations have been met in Claim 13. See

Claim 13 for details. Sanderson, achieves the aspect of instruction data including the

indication of the type of construction elements characterizing the visualization model to

be created, wherein in FIG. 2, Specification 209, Content 207 and DataElement 208 contain the element characters to be created.

Regarding Claim 18, most of the limitations have been met in Claim 13. See Claim 13 for details. Sanderson discloses the claimed aspect of wherein locally available data are updated at the level of the client terminal through the following steps, at the level of the server, a storing message is generated which includes storing instruction data and data to be stored, storing message is transmitted to the client terminal, at the level of the client terminal, instruction data are interpreted in order to perform the storing, and the data to be stored are stored in a local memory, wherein in FIG. 2, Client 201D, delivers data to and from the Model read and writes are performed to DataElement 208.

Regarding Claim 19, most of the limitations have been met in Claim 13. See Claim 13 for details. Sanderson achieves the claimed aspect of display at the level of the client terminal through the use of a navigator, wherein in FIG.1 a system is illustrates a content browser 101 that can be any application suitable for decoding and displaying markup either in a desktop or handheld environment. (Sanderson, Page 10, Paragraph 5).

Regarding Claim 20, most of the limitations have been met in Claim 13. See Claim 13 for details. Davis discloses the claimed aspect of some construction elements of the visualization models use a XML format, wherein the projector 100 responds to the viewer 200 with the interface component of the software application in a descriptive language such as Extensible Markup Language ("XML") (step 312) and the XML stream includes information about each widget that is needed by the client computer 202 to execute the software application. (Davis, Page 3, Paragraph 0030, lines 8-14).

However, Davis does not teach the claimed aspect of the merging result is translated to the HTML format in order to be displayed. On the other hand, Sanderson achieves the claimed aspect of the result to be displayed as HTML format, wherein in FIG. 1 content is displayed on a content browser 101 is a web browser for interpreting HTML compliant markup. (Sanderson, Page 10, Paragraph 5, lines 4-6).

It would be obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to enhance Davis's invention with Sanderson's invention feature to translate the merged results to HTML format, because it will allow other remote users to access the content browser.

Regarding Claim 21, Davis discloses the claimed aspect of graphic interfacing between a user and a computer system in which the following operations are performed "inputting a user request at the level of client terminal", wherein in the flowchart of FIG. 3, illustrates client computer 202 connects to server 102 and send a request from client

computer 202(step 302) and the request is transmitted to a server part 104 in view of

being processed and for generating a response. (Davis, FIG.1). Additionally, Sanderson

discloses a computer system in FIG. 1 representing a client-server computing

environment for use in a system for dynamically generating an interactive user interface.

Furthermore Davis discloses the claimed aspect of receiving the response at the level of

the client terminal, displaying the response result for the user, wherein application

storage 108 sends interface component and code component of the requested

application. Specifically, Davis discloses the claimed aspect of the client terminal

receives a response comprising instruction data and data to be displayed at the level of

the client terminal, instruction data are executed in order to construct a visualization

model to be used at the level of the client terminal, said visualization model is created

through the association of construction elements locally available, wherein projector 100

transmits XML stream of interface component of software application to viewer 200 and

viewer 200 has information about what each widget needed. (Davis, FIG.3).

However, Davis does not teach the claimed aspect of data to be displayed and

merged with the visualization model in order to display merging result. On the other

hand Sanderson discloses the claimed aspect, wherein UI generator communicates

with databases and initiates a user interface. (Page 9, Paragraph 0010, lines 1-3).

Specifically, Sanderson illustrates the aspect of displayed and merged data on the

interface in FIG. 1, 104A.

It would be obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to enhance Davis's invention with Sanderson's invention to merge the interface with the data, because all applications need data in order to perform a function.

Regarding Claim 22, most of the limitations have been met in Claim 21. See Claim 21 for details. Davis discloses the claimed aspect of construction elements including a descriptive interface of the visualization model objects, a presentation layer and some logical rules to be applied locally to the visualization model, wherein viewer 200 renders the graphical user interface with the native widget set of the client computer's operating system, based on the widget information from the projector and therefore, the native widget set dictates the appearance of the widgets, such as their style and shape, and the interface for the application looks and feels like a native desktop application. (Davis, FIG. 3, See Abstract)

Regarding Claim 23, most of the limitations have been met in Claim 21. See Claim 21 for details. Sanderson, discloses the claimed aspect in FIG. 2 wherein a validator 211 and format 212 illustrated to apply logical rules. Additionally, Davis discloses the aspect the construction elements including a descriptive interface of the visualization model objects, a presentation layer and some logical rules to be applied locally to the visualization model, wherein viewer 200 renders the graphical user interface with the native widget set of the client computer's operating system, based on the widget information from the projector and therefore, the native widget set dictates

the appearance of the widgets, such as their style and shape, and the interface for the

application looks and feels like a native desktop application. (Davis, FIG. 3, See

Abstract).

Regarding Claim 24, most of the limitations have been met in Claim 21. See

Claim 21 for details. Sanderson achieves the claimed aspect of display at the level of

the client terminal through the use of a navigator, wherein in FIG.1 a system is

illustrates a content browser 101 that can be any application suitable for decoding and

displaying markup either in a desktop or handheld environment. (Sanderson, Page 10,

Paragraph 5).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

1) Smith et al., US 5,119,475, 06/02/1992, "Object-oriented framework for menu

definition".

2) Spitzer, US 5,237,529, 08/17/1993, "Microstructure array and activation system
therefor ".

3) Kiri, et al., US 5448740, 09/05/1995, "Generation of a user interface code from a
corresponding declarative language program ".

4) Burkardt, et al., US 6320,602, 11/20/2001, "Region layout in a view on a graphical display screen ".

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ECE HUR whose telephone number is 571 270-1972. The examiner can normally be reached on MONDAY-THURSDAY 7:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, FRANTZ COBY can be reached on (571) 272-4017. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the · Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ece Hur
E.H./e.h.

July 18, 2007

FRANTZ COBY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER